

THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION

PARIS OFFICE

20, RUE DE LA BAUME

906

Program Typology

Acta 93

SUBJECT: Classification of Programs

IN REPLY TO: RMP to AG, February 19, 1929

RMP 4/4/29	RMP 4/10
REL	REL
MLK	KK

FROM: Alan Gregg

TO: R. M. Pearce

DATE: Marc. 26, 1929

I have gone over this and subsequent memoranda dealing with various phases of programs to go into force during the current year and in 1930. It has also been useful to compare these memoranda with the European budget of the D.M.E. which you prepared last May for O'B and myself.

Looking broadly at the problem of systematizing our various types of work exclusive of surveys and capital projects it seems to me that a description could be made of these different types of work which would be clear and helpful to the Trustees, and a different description could be made which would be more useful to us as administrators in search of certain results. To put it in an other way, you can describe in terms of ends and objectives the work you have in mind in medical sciences. This is substantially what I find in the recommendations of the Executive Committee presented at the Trustees' meeting of January 3rd as a program of activities looking to the advancement of knowledge. Now, with the same ends and objectives in mind I would like to present another statement of the same programs but this time in terms of the means and methods to be employed. If a parallel is of any use in explaining myself, one might say that the program of a concert is definable in terms of numbers, composers and players, but that for those in charge of realizing the concert, the program is really more immediately concerned with hiring the auditorium,

moving the pianos, selling the tickets and providing the lighting, accommodations, etc.

It occurred to me that it might be^a useful thing to write down in a vertical column the programs we contemplate (exclusive of capital aid) and then in a horizontal column to write some of the main administrative questions which we meet in carrying out these programs. This I have done, as you will see, on the succeeding page, and I feel that such a method of treating our programs will at least have the advantage of clarifying in my own mind the status of some of our undertakings. Furthermore, I am rather inclined to believe that this table suggests methods of classification which are both rapid and clear and which would facilitate our work on the financial side. In other words, I propose for 1930 a classification of programs based on the way that these programs are handled in preference to a classification based upon the somewhat more abstract term of the objectives to be accomplished.

Miss Crowell is not here and this accounts for my not having consulted her or incorporated any of her programs in this memorandum.

Comment on Table

- a) At present one of the most difficult points and one in which Dr. Tisdale also finds much trouble. Probably the only way to make this item automatic would be to reserve a sum of \$200 per fellow, per year for equipment, but this procedure would be always open to a certain degree of abuse.
- b) There is some administrative work in communicating with publishers and dealers and in listing journals subscribed to, etc., but this is satisfactorily attended to by M. Boillot without taking any of O'B's time.
- c) The figure of \$3,000 is, of course, arbitrary. Grants in aid, grants for surveys, for special publications and for conferences might, of course, occasionally exceed this sum.

- d) In the future as in all but a few cases in the past, no grant for any faculty, for literature, will exceed \$3,000.
- e) In most of the developmental aid centers experience has shown that the annual total for stipends is within \$3,000 since not all the available places are occupied.
- f & g) New York has a decision on the establishment or discontinuance of the general program, the Paris Office settling matters of detail.

If the attached table suggests to you classifications of practical utility it would be helpful to have names for the different types of aid, names which would be at once brief and descriptive. I would suggest that programs involving a single appropriation and not recurrent annually should have the name of "Grants" and that programs involving the possibility or certainty of recurrent annual appropriation should be referred to as "Funds". Thus, the first 3 items might well be called "Grants in Aid" and it may be noted that this group has as its objective item: V, VII-3 & 4 III-1 of the program presented to the Trustees on January 3rd. The next 5 items might be called "Travel grants"; they serve items VII-1 and 2 particularly. Laboratory equipment for travelling fellows; laboratory equipment for recipients of developmental aid and literature programs I would group under the term "Equipment Fund"; this is for objectives V and VI. It will be noted that literature is rapidly becoming a minor element. The next 3 items could be grouped under a program that might be called "Fellowship Fund" for objective VI. Aid to leaders, assistance to promising men and assistance to hold occasional individuals at important work (e.g. Cairns) might be called "Fund in support of leaders", inasmuch as the implication

of special merit in the case of the younger individuals is useful to keep in mind although I would not wish to confuse promising younger men with individuals of established teaching or investigative ability. This would sub-serve points II and IV of the Executive Committee's recommendations of January 3rd. The last 2 items, namely: Fluid Research and Aid to London Units, exclusive of U.C.H. I have grouped together under the title of "Fluid Research Fund" though I expect that fluid research method of appropriation would be in practice confined to America for at least the next two years and although it might be possible to find satisfactory conditions in certain countries here. This concerns particularly item III-2.

If you ask me to calculate the amounts of money to budget against the above six categories for 1930 I should be glad to re-examine the following rough estimate:-

Grants in aid	\$ 30,000
Travel grants	10,000
Equipment fund	30,000
Fellowship fund (including \$15,000 to M.R.C. and \$15,000 to Notgemain.)	100,000
Fund in support of leaders	30,000
Fluid research fund, not more than	10,000

So far as I understand the possible aid given to London units exclusive of U.C.H., these estimates involve a total of \$ 210,000 and I would like to point out that according to enclosed table from 7 to 11 of all these programs are subject to decision in New York. Consequently the difference between the present sum to be administered by the Paris Office and that proposed is largely under your own control.

In closing I would say that I may have gone too far in suggesting

so complete a realignment of our programs but that I, in any case, am very sure that your comments on the points which I have marked with a red question-mark will help a great deal in clarifying my mind regarding certain phases of your plans.

AG.

AG:st

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	Single Appropriations	Recurrent Appropriat.	Salary and/or Travel	Material (Apparatus - Animals)	Administration required	No administration after appropriat.	Above \$ 3,000	Below \$ 3,000	N.Y. decides on re- commendation from Paris	Paris Office decides and reports
Grants in Aid	x			x		x		x		x
Labor. equip. to Returned fellows	x			x		x		x		x
Publications	x			x		x	?		x	
Travel of prof ^{ors} in Europe	x		x		x			x		x
Travel of advanced men in Europe	x		x		x			x		x
Visit. Commissions	x		x		x		x		x	
Travel of prof ^{ors} to U.S.	x		x		x		x		x	
Conference expenses	x		x		x		?		x	
Labor. equip. for travel. fellows		x		x	a			x		x
Labor. equip. for Dev. aid fellows		x		x		x		x		x
Literature		x		x	b	x		d		x
Travel. fellowsh.		x	x		x			x		x
M.R.C. & Notgemein.		x	x			x	x		x	
Develop. Aid Program		x	x			x	x		f	g
Aid to Leaders		x		x		x	x	?	x	?
Ass. to promising men		x	?	x		x		x	?	x
Hold. men at import- ant work (e.g. Cairns)		x	x	?		x	x	x	?	x
Fluid Research		x	?	x		x	x		x	
Aid to London Units		x	?	x		x	x	?	?	